

CITY OF MIAMI BEACH
Office of the City Manager
Letter to Commission No. 105-2004



To: Mayor David Dermer and
Members of the City Commission

Date: May 12, 2004

From: Jorge M. Gonzalez
City Manager

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jorge".

Subject: EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

As part of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) process, which analyzes the City's Comprehensive Plan, public meetings have been scheduled to obtain the comments, suggestions and concerns of the citizens regarding major issues that may face the City now and in the future. The input that was gathered, along with other information about the Comprehensive Plan and the EAR Process, is attached for your information.

At the joint City Commission/Planning Board Workshop, scheduled for May 12, 2004 at 6 pm, 4-5 major issues must be selected by the Commission so that staff can begin the data gathering and analysis necessary to complete the EAR report.

There is one more public meeting before the combined workshop, scheduled for 7 pm at the Normandy Shores Golf Clubhouse on Monday, May 10. Information gathered at this meeting will be presented during the Workshop.

Handwritten initials in black ink, likely representing the signatories: JMG, CMC, JGG, and SF.
JMG/CMC/JGG/SF

c: Cristina C. Cuervo, Assistant City Manager
Jorge G. Gomez, AICP, Planning Director
Steve Foren, AICP, Senior Planner

Enclosures: Comprehensive Plan
EAR Scope Statement
EAR Timeline
Work Breakdown Schedule
Table of Public/Staff Comments

Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is a legal document that guides the actions of the City and provides a vision at least 10 years into the future. The City's Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the City Commission in 1989 after a series of public hearings, updated in 1994 and was amended several times in subsequent years. The Comprehensive Plan should be used to guide and prioritize the actions of the City through the duration of its time period, at which time it should be re-written to reflect a new timeline, a new set of opinions and issues, and the desires of a changed set of residents. That time of renewal is upon us now, with the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) project being undertaken by the Planning Department.

The CMB Comprehensive Plan can be found in the following folder:
M:\\$CMB\CMB Comprehensive Plan

If you have any questions about the EAR process, the Comprehensive Plan, or the upcoming combined Commission/Planning Board workshop, please contact Jorge Gomez, Planning Director, or Steve Foren, EAR Project Manager. Both are in the Planning Dept. at x7550

CMB 2005 EAR Scope Statement

A local government comprehensive plan is a living document. While it is designed to provide certainty in the development of a city or county, in part through limitations on amendments and requirements for financial feasibility, it is also designed to respond to changes in a local jurisdiction. Response to changes comes in part through amendments to the plan, through revisions to methods of implementation, and in large measure to a periodic evaluation of the plan. State law, Ch 163.3191(1), requires such a periodic evaluation, called an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), to be completed every 7 years.

The EAR is intended to accomplish several important objectives:

- Identify major issues for the community
- Review past actions of the local government in implementing the plan since the last EAR
- Assess the degree to which plan objectives have been achieved
- Assess both successes and shortcomings of the plan
- Identify ways that the plan should be changed to:
 - Respond to changing conditions and trends affecting the local community
 - Respond to the need for new data
 - Respond to changes in state requirements regarding growth management and development
 - Respond to changes in regional plans
 - Ensure effective intergovernmental coordination

The EAR process will result in creation of an EAR document and a copy of the adoption resolution or ordinance. The EAR document will contain the information listed above as required by DCA, as well as recommendations for rectifying both identified shortcomings and areas where plan objectives have not been achieved.

EAR Timeline

March 10:	First Dept Reps meeting
March 31:	Second Dept Reps meeting – Issue Input
Apr 15, 16 & 19:	Three public meetings
April 30:	Scoping Meeting w/State agencies, M-D Co, municipalities.
May 4 and 10:	Two public meetings
May 12:	Public hearing on Major Issues with LPA, Commission
Mid-May 2004:	Transmit Final Issues list to DCA
May-Sept:	Analyze Comp Plan per DCA instructions vis Major Issues
Mid-Aug:	Draft of analysis to Planning Staff
October 1:	Final Analysis to Planning Staff
26 Oct 2004:	Public Hearing on Draft EAR (or special hearing, sep date)
Nov 2004:	Transmit Draft EAR to DCA
Jan-Feb:	Revise Draft per DCA comments
22 Feb 2005:	Final Public Hearing with LPA
23 or 30 March 2005:	Adoption hearing before City Commission
1 April, 2005:	EAR due to DCA

EAR Work Breakdown Schedule (WBS)

- 1.0 Identify Major Issues
 - 1.1 Identify Department Representatives
 - 1.2 Conduct Staff meetings for Issue input
 - 1.3 Conduct Public meetings
 - 1.3.1 Conduct advertising- papers, tv, flyers, HOA's, etc
 - 1.3.2 Find Locations – North, Mid, South
 - 1.3.3 Hold Meetings
 - 1.4 Conduct Scoping meeting with DCA, SFRPC, M-D Co, Municipalities
 - 1.5 Conduct Workshop with Commission, LPA and public
 - 1.6 Send compiled Issues list to participants and DCA
 - 1.6.1 Request letter of understanding from DCA
- 2.0 Prepare a Draft EAR (parts 2.2 – 2.8 are concurrent, not linear)
 - 2.1 Gather data
 - 2.1.1 Get Population data from County/2000 Census
 - 2.1.2 Ascertain extent of vacant/developable land
 - 2.2 Assess performance of Comp Plan
 - 2.2.1 Assess past performance of GOP's with Major Issues
 - 2.2.2 Assess past completion of required policies
 - 2.2.3 Analyze Comp Plan objectives with relation to Major Issues
 - 2.3 Assess Comp Plan compatibility with changes to CH 163 and 9J-5
 - 2.4 Assess financial feasibility of Comp Plan and Infrastructure
 - 2.5 Create Public Participation summary
 - 2.6 Create 10 year Water Supply Plan document
 - 2.7 Assess school coordination plan
 - 2.8 Analyze past down zoning
 - 2.8.1 Ascertain impact on property owners
 - 2.8.2 Analyze impact of post-disaster reconstruction on prop owners
- 3.0 Conduct public hearing with Commission, LPA and public
- 4.0 Transmit Draft EAR to State and Local agencies
- 5.0 Revise EAR, if necessary
- 6.0 Identify required changes to Comp Plan
- 7.0 Adopt Final EAR
 - 7.1 Conduct public hearing with Commission, LPA and public
 - 7.2 Transmit Final EAR to RPC and DCA
- 8.0 Begin Work on EAR-based Amendments

Public Issue	Comments	Major Issue Topic	Issue Raised by:
Traffic	Coordinating Signalization 63 rd Str Flyover Chokepoints-study and remedy(Collins 63 rd to 72 nd 2 lanes) Flow and congestion Put loading zone in each block to reduce lane blockage Prohibit expansion of capacity, maintain LOS standards Limit construction traffic numbers/hours Enforcement- speed limits, double parking of commercial veh esp, and buses stopping in traffic lanes instead of at bus stops.	Traffic Congestion	All
Quality of Life	Enforcement of loitering/open liquor/dog litter cleanup/illegal subdivision of SF homes laws Dirty streets/paint crosswalks Streetscaping- landscapes, bus shelters, signs/poles in sidewalk, add street furniture	Quality of Life Ped/Bicycle	All
Infrastructure	Maint - seawalls, sidewalks Repair work should be done at night in streets, not during rush hour, and in a timely manner, 42 nd str torn up for months Improve capacity - sewer, Storm water backups Bridge and street repaving/repair Put utilities underground	Infra Maint Public Works Concurrency Quality of Life	All
E-Gov't	Serve public better/faster/efficiently - Forms/applications online Improve planning process thru participatory websites, etc IT methods of improving traffic/transit info, noise monitoring	Quality of Life	All
Econ Redev	Attract national brands - Target, etc	Econ Dev	North

Housing	Lack of Affordable for middle class on down Assisted housing too concentrated in NoBe/poor maint Place assisted housing over public surface lots, lower cost Demo of SF/bldg MacMansions-need design guidelines	Housing	All
Concurrency	Roads, infrastructure, schools, libraries Fees that leave the jurisdiction and are not returned by the collecting agency	Concurrency	North, Middle
Transit	Attract water taxis/buses Incentivize development/use Residential transit cards? Improve internal circulator-perception of ineffectiveness Have rail cross from Miami and Stop at Potamkin Site, transfer to improved Electro-Wave	Traffic Congestion	All
Parks	Maint/landscaping/safety(homeless) Create dog and skate parks and playgrounds/tot lots Add some hard surfaces to parks for kids to ride bikes, rollerblade, etc Greenway creation	Parks	All
Beach Issues	Erosion Beach walk Street ends - coord designs? Better Maint.	Inter-Gov Ped/Bike	North, Middle
Homeless	Safety/cleanliness/deter visitors/shoppers	Quality of Life	North, Middle
Parking	Not enough Too many garages Cabs parking on sidewalks Prioritize residents over visitors Entering/exiting on weekend nights/sp events is difficult	Parking	North, South
Sustainable Develop	Environmental practices "green roofs" Recycling/reuse of resources water, etc Bldg Materials	EAR Based Amend	South

Disaster Mitigation	Control development - coastal high hazard area Stop over development Emergency crew response slowed by congestion, ie into Aqua. Post-disaster redevelopment?	Over-Dev Haz Mitigation	South
Pedestrian / Bicycle	Landscaping/shade trees Prioritize ped over auto - widen sidewalks, remove impediments such as signs, poles, etc Improve network of bike lanes/trails, utilize wide side streets to narrow lanes, add angled parking and bike lanes Improve areas to bike in n'hoods Improve safety Flyovers/underpasses for crosswalks	Ped/Bike	Middle, South
Demographic	As avg age lowers, city services need to adjust pro-actively Shopping needs change, incentivize required uses	Quality of Life	South
Home Rule	Electricity distribution, etc		South
Intellectual property	Using resident's knowledge to assist gov't and residents		South
Public-Private partnerships	Inter-agency, inter-group (ie Botanical garden-Convention Center), city-N'hood Assoc/HOA	Inter-gov coord	Middle, South
Economic Analysis	Spend equal time/resources on residential and comm Dev		South
3 disparate districts	NoBe, Mid and SoBe Gov't has failed to address different needs/character/desires Different regs for different districts	Quality of Life	South
Shade tree canopy	Need more shade trees Need Shade master plan for City/N'hoods/districts	Ped/Bike	Middle, South

Over-development	Density/height-size of buildings - creates walls on south and west of city also FAR's too high Aggregation of lots allowing bigger buildings-out of scale/character Relates to Q of L issues Certain uses too concentrated in certain areas Create a "N'hood carry capacity" to limit concentrations of use Too many people	Land Use mix/comp	Middle, South
Special Events	City capacity to absorb these must be taken into account	Quality of Life	South
Comm. uses in Res areas	Specify and limit what is allowed, and how much	Land Use mix/comp	South
Incompatibility of Uses	Prioritize resident's first Incentivize moving uses out of incompatible areas to more compatible areas Create "Moats" of buffer uses between res and noisy uses	Land Use mix/comp	South
Enforcement of existing regs	Q of L issues-hedges, private landscaping blocking sidewalks Limit hedge height as we do wall height. Disseminate City regs proactively	Quality of Life	All
Noise	From clubs, from club-goers after leaving clubs, from street-partiers, cars with booming stereos, restaurants acting as clubs; Incompatible uses in close proximity;	Quality of Life	City Staff
N'hood preservation	Incompatible development, out of context buildings Uses tend to get replaced with double/triple intensity/density Tax break to incentivize N'hood character, and limit the ability to increase density/intensity	Land Use mix/comp	Middle

Lack of emphasis on supporting/enhancing the Arts	A world class city needs high level of arts; not fully supported; land prices are hurting non-profits; Street Furniture	Ped/Bike	City Staff Middle
Mis-perception about City population	90,000 residents, 25-40,000 seasonal residents, and over 120,000 visitors and tourists; funding from Fed/State/County is based on 90K residents, not enough to support the services needed for 200K+		City Staff
N'hood issues	Perception that Dade-41 st Street ignored Construction(pub and Private) ignoring regs More commo between City and N'hood assoc/HoA's etc	N'hood svcs	Middle

F:\PLAN\ALL\Comprehensive Plan\05 EAR\Major Issue input\Major Issue worksheet.doc